

Salute To Saratchandra—The Great Litterateur

The birth centenary of Sarat Chandra Chattopadhyaya, the great litterateur, a notable personality in the freedom movement, an uncompromising crusader for a rational social-political-cultural order, a gallant fighter for social justice, a brilliant scientific mind, a bold champion of liberation of womanhood, comes this year.

The tremendous enthusiasm and spontaneity of the people to re-read and evaluate anew the great contributions to social-cultural movements and the secular-humanist democratic values bequeathed to us by this great artist, on this occasion, proves to the hilt that no amount of confusion and deliberate distortions about his literary creations—the values upheld by him and the fables and fictions spun around his personality by the vested interests, the social pacifists, the so-called art critics, the philistines and pseudo-Marxists have been able to snap the bond of love and respect that Sarat Chandra could happily establish with his countrymen by rare togetherness in common trials and tribulations, common pain and sufferings, for a common goal and aspiration.

The birth-centenary of Sarat Chandra, should, therefore, in the fitness of things, be observed with due seriousness and in a befitting manner by his countrymen, particularly in Bengal where he could create deepest impact, for obvious reasons. Some of the organisations and Committee formed for this occasion have no doubt celebrated the centenary, but to tell the truth, most of them did it more as a ritual than with any serious understanding and purpose. From the informations we have received so far, we understand that in Assam Sarat Centenary has already been observed in a befitting manner and in other states also similar programmes have either been taken or soon will be taken.

Pathikrit for long, guided by the teachings and illuminating analyses about Sarat Chandra's real worth and about different important aspects of cultural movement in our country, given by our revered teacher and leader,

a leading Marxist philosopher of our era, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, has been propagating the high ideas and thoughts—the secular humanist values in Sarat Chandra's literary creations to our people.

On this occasion, the All Bengal Sarat Centenary Committee, has taken a week-long programme as an initial part of year-long campaign throughout the length and breadth of the country and down to the district and village levels. The importance of this drive can be well appreciated when grave onslaughts on minimum sense of moral values are shattering the very cultural fabric of our society.

The week-long programme included organising street corner meetings, selling of metallic badges with the Artist's picture engraved, competition of dramas composed on Sarat Chandra's short stories and other works, seminar, lecture series, exhibition etc. The response of the people was magnificent.

The All Bengal Sarat Centenary Committee have placed the following demands to the Government.

TO OUR READERS

There will be no publication of 'PROLETARIAN ERA' on October 15, 1975 as the press will remain closed during the Pujas.

Manager,
PROLETARIAN ERA.

(1) All published and unpublished works of Sarat Chandra should be brought out in a low-price edition :

(2) The task of editing should be entrusted to a committee of specialists, who would arrange for published editions :

(3) Authentic translation of the work of Sarat Chandra should be published in all the Indian languages, including English :

Proletarian Era

ORGAN OF SOCIALIST UNITY CENTRE OF INDIA (FORTNIGHTLY)

Editor-in-Chief—Shibdas Ghosh

VOL 9
No. 4

1st OCTOBER '75
WEDNESDAY

PRICE 30 P.
Air Surcharge 4 P.

(4) The residence of Sarat Chandra should be converted into a Sarat Museum to house his original manuscripts and mementos :

(5) Sarat Memorial lectureship should be instituted in all leading Indian Universities and a special Chair named after him should be created in the Department of Bengali of the Calcutta University ;
(6) A statue of Sarat Chandra should be installed at a prominent place in Calcutta.

Sarat Chandra, who was in the thick of freedom movement and was never wavering in his full-throated support to the uncompromising revolutionary trend within this movement, who never hesitated to give fitting rebuff to whoever dared downgrading the revolutionaries in our national movement, a man who by his character and concrete works made himself a close friend, an associate and a counsel of national leaders of such heights like Deshbandhu Chittaranjan Das and Netaji Subhas and all the top-ranking revolutionary leaders hardly requires any credential for his patriotism.

It would, however, have been meet and proper if a Great Artist like Sarat Chandra would have got his rightful place and well-deserved honour. The best way that a nation can pay tribute to a noble and great artist lies in his proper evaluation, appreciation and assimilation of the values, the thoughts and ideas he has left

BONUS ORDINANCE—

Added Hardship To And Payout For Workers And Maximum Monopoly

Profit For The Employers

—FATICK GHOSH

Calcutta, 25th September : Com. Fatick Ghosh, General Secretary, West Bengal State Committee of UTUC (Lenin Sarani) has issued the following statement to the Press :—... ..

behind. For that an unbiased attitude is essential. Dissemination of his ideas and thoughts can only be done by wide circulation of his works, preservation of manuscripts and documents and encouragement to debates and discussions about his contributions. With this end in view, the All Bengal Sarat Centenary Committee has suggested some measures. If there has been gross injustice to this noble Artist in the past, occasion is here to make an amend. But we are yet to see that the Government is discharging its obligation with some positive steps.

But, one thing we cannot but take note of seriously. When the attempt to 'kill by silence' this great artist and his creations have been proved abortive particularly in the background of widespread propagation by Pathikrit, the scientific evaluation of Sarat Chandra made by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, a leading Marxist thinker of the present era, there is now a fresh attempt from the

interested quarters visible on this occasion, to tarnish the image and role of Sarat Chandra by diabolical distortions of his social, political, literary thoughts and ideas

The parties, individuals and groups who had so long maintained studied silence about Sarat Chandra, now seem to be suddenly warmed up on this occasion in giving their negative service to the proper understanding about and correct evaluation of Sarat Chandra and his great contributions in morals, ethics and values, in upholding with rare sincerity and steadfastness, the cause of social justice, for the millions and millions of the oppressed, insulted and humiliated ; his uncompromising fight against feudal culture, religious bigotry, obscurantism and all putrid values that enchained the march of human mind.

Sarat Chandra served his time and people not from ivory tower of seclusion, nor from an idyllic world of senile humanism

(Contd. to Page 8)

Rise Of Fascism In Italy And Germany (4)

IV. : The Lessons.

Reporting to the Seventeenth Party Congress of C.P.S.U.(B), in January, 1934, Comrade Stalin said: "...I have in mind the continuing general crisis of capitalism in the circumstances of which the economic crisis is proceeding with the chronic under capacity operation of the enterprises, chronic mass unemployment; the interweaving of the industrial crisis and agricultural crisis; the absence of tendencies towards a more or less serious renewal of fixed capital which usually heralds the approach of a boom etc. etc.

"Evidently, what we are witnessing is a transition from the lowest point of decline of industry, from the lowest point of the industrial crisis to a depression—not an ordinary depression, but a depression of a special kind

"The masses of the people have not yet reached the stage when they are ready to storm capitalism, but the idea of storming it is maturing in the minds of the masses—of that there can hardly be any doubt.....

".....This indeed explains why the ruling classes in the capitalist countries are so zealously destroying or nullifying the last vestiges of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy which might be used by the working class in its struggle against the oppressors, why they are driving the communist parties underground and resorting to openly terrorist methods of maintaining their dictatorship...

"It is not surprising that fascism has now become the most fashionable commodity among warmongering bourgeois politicians. I am referring not only to fascism in general, but primarily to fascism of the German type, which is wrongly called national socialism—wrongly because the most searching examination will fail to reveal an atom of socialism in it."

"In this connection the victory of fascism in

Germany must be regarded not only as a symptom of the weakness of the working class and a result of the betrayals of the working class by social democracy, which paved the way for fascism; it must also be regarded as a sign of the weakness of the bourgeoisie, a sign that the bourgeoisie is no longer able to rule by the old methods of parliamentarism and bourgeois democracy, and as a consequence, is compelled in its home policy to resort to terrorist methods of rule—as a sign that it is no longer able to find a way out of the present situation on the basis of a peaceful foreign policy, and, as a consequence, is compelled to resort to a policy of war."

(Stalin, works. Vol. 13 pp. 296-300).

"Some comrades think that, once there is a revolutionary crisis, the bourgeoisie is bound to get into a hopeless position, that its end is therefore a foregone conclusion, that the victory of the revolution is thus assured, and that all they have to do is to wait for the fall of the bourgeoisie and to draw up victorious resolutions. That is a profound mistake. *The victory of the revolution never comes of itself. It must be prepared for and won. And only a strong proletarian revolutionary party can prepare for and win victory. Moments occur when the situation is revolutionary, when the rule of the bourgeoisie is shaken to its very foundations and yet the victory of the revolution does not come, because there is no revolutionary party of the proletariat with sufficient strength and prestige to lead the masses and to take power*"

(ibid. pp. 304 305). (Emphasis ours.—Editor, P.Era.)

Fascism adopts dual policy—of suppression and persuasion—only the radical section of the Bourgeoisie can bring it.

Placing his report before the Seventh World Congress of Communist

International in 1935, Georgie Dimitrov characterised fascism 'merely "as the open terrorist dictatorship of the most reactionary, most chauvinistic and most imperialist elements of finance capital."

We need not deal here in details with the Dimitrov Report because we have dealt with it in our earlier discussions to show the various inaccuracies, oversimplifications and inadequacies that have been pointed out by our beloved leader and teacher, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh in his various analyses, some portions of which we have earlier quoted and shall do it later.

We would however like to quote the note of warning in the Dimitrov Report uttered against the revisionist trend within the communist movement and the social democratic thought-process of this trend that spells great danger to working class revolutionary movement to the advantage of the fascist tricks of the bourgeoisie.

Dimitrov said ".....it is a mistake, no less serious and dangerous, to under-rate the importance, for the establishment of fascist dictatorship, of the *reactionary measures of the bourgeoisie at present increasingly developing in bourgeois democratic countries*—measures which suppress the democratic liberties of the working people, falsify and curtail the right of Parliament and intensify the repression of the revolutionary movement."

(Italics in the original).

"For.....before the establishment of a fascist dictatorship, bourgeois governments usually pass through a number of parliamentary stages and adopt a number of reactionary measures which directly facilitate the accession to power of fascism. Whoever does not fight the reactionary measures of the bourgeoisie and growth of fascism at these preparatory stage is not in a position to

prevent the victory of fascism, but on the contrary facilitates that victory".

(Emphasis ours—Italics in the original).

Interpreting scientifically this particular phenomenon as can be seen in different bourgeois democracies in the post-war situation, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our beloved leader and teacher and eminent Marxist thinker in our time has taught us:

"It should be borne in mind in this connection that most of the Social Democratic Parties affiliated to the Second International who subsequently turned into revisionist and national chauvinist, because of looseness in their organisational structures could not bring about fascism; rather it was those Social-Democratic Parties who were of more militant in character and fostered fanaticism and blindness in the ranks that gave birth to fascism, internationally.

In our time, the Social-Democratic parties after having been thoroughly exposed and isolated from the mainstream of communist movement, those communist parties within the international communist movement who have degenerated to revisionist parties and reduced themselves to 'National' Communist Parties (or in other words, who are communist in name only but Social-Democratic parties in practice), show the fullest possibility of turning themselves into fascist parties and, thereby only, if these parties, waving the red banner and under cover of Marxism can combine blindness and fanaticism with their so-called militant character. For militancy borne out of revolutionary ideology is not one and the same with the so-called militancy generated by fanaticism, blindness and superstition. They are qualitatively different."

(Free translation from Comrade Shibdas Ghosh's "Why SUCI is the only Communist Party In Indian Soil" (Bengali). pp. 26-27—

responsibility is ours—Editor, P. Era.).

Judging the post-war phenomena from this teaching of Comrade Ghosh, one can very well detect the despicable role of these Social-Democratic parties who are becoming directly instrumental in helping the radical section of the bourgeoisie to adopt fascist means and devices to dupe the toiling masses.

The social treachery of these Social-Democratic parties (notwithstanding the difference in their names) analogous to that of their counter-parts in Italy and Germany, Austria etc. etc. are to attain socialism through bourgeois parliament and in alliance with the radical section of the bourgeoisie. They have, therefore, made a complete renunciation of the revolutionary teachings of Marxism-Leninism that Working class can not lay their hands on the ready-made state machinery of the bourgeoisie to accomplish the tasks of the proletarian revolution. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our beloved leader and teacher and an eminent Marxist thinker of the era, drawing the correct lessons from the historical experiences and developments since the world capitalism entered into the third general crisis, which is a overall crisis, pointed out the urgency of revising and improving upon the classical concept about fascism in order to make it an effective guide to action for the success of working class movement in all the capitalist countries against fascism.

Comrade Ghosh drew the attention of the working-class movement to the fact:

"The distinguishing features of fascism, namely economic centralisation, maximum concentration of political power in the state, administrative rigid firmness, cultural regimentation and identification of the interests of the monopolies with that of the state, are discernible, no doubt,

(Contd. to Page 6)

ON AGRARIAN QUESTION

The object of this article is to give a brief outline of the sum total of the social economic relations in Russian agriculture.....For the time being we must definitely establish the fact that private ownership of land in Russia is developing away from social estate to non-social estate ownership. At the end of the nineteenth century, feudal landownership of the nobility still embraced the overwhelming majority of all privately-owned lands, but the trend of development is obviously towards the creation of bourgeois private landownership. Private ownership of land acquired by inheritance from the olden-time armed retainers, manorial landowners, and tenants by service etc., is on the decline. *Private ownership of land acquired purely and simply with money is on the increase. The power of land is declining, the power of money is growing. Land is being drawn more and more into the stream of commerce;* (Italics—added).....But to what extent the "power of the land", that is to say, the power of medieval landlordism, was still strong in Russia at the end of the nineteenth century is strikingly shown by the figures of the distribution of privately-owned land according to size of properties.....Let us pass to allotment holdings. Except for 19 million dessiatines not allocated according to size of holding all the rest of the land, totalling 136.9 million dessiatines, belongs to 12½ million peasant households. On the average this is 11.1 dessiatines per household. But allotment land too is distributed unevenly: almost half i.e. 64 million out of 137 million dessiatines, belongs to 2.1 million households rich in land, i.e., to one-sixth of the total number....more than half of the allotment households, 6.2 million out of 12.3, have up to 8 dessiatines per household. Taken on the average for Russia as a whole, this amount of land is

absolutely insufficient to maintain a family.....Six million households stand for a population of from 24 to 30 million. And this whole mass consists of paupers, who have been allotted paltry strips of land which can provide no livelihood, and on which one can only die of starvation. If we assume that in order to make ends meet on a more or less solvent farm not less than 15 dessiatines are required, then we get 10 million peasant households below that standard, possessing 72.9 million dessiatines of land.

To proceed. In regard to allotment holdings a very important feature must be noted. The unevenness in the distribution of allotment land among the peasants is immeasurably less than that in the distribution of privately owned land. On the other hand, among the allotment holding peasants there is a host of other distinctions, classifications and divisions.....Let us now examine the organisation of the landlord economy. It is generally known that the main feature of this organisation is the combination of the capitalist system ("free hire") and labour service economy. What is this labour-service system?

To answer this question we must glance back to the organisation of landlord economy under serfdom. Everyone knows what serfdom was legally, administratively and domestically. But seldom do people ask themselves, what essentially were the economic relations between the landlords and the peasants under serfdom? At that time the landlords allotted land to the peasants. Sometimes they loaned the peasants other means of production too, for example, wood lots, cattle etc. What did this allotment of the landlords' land to the serf peasants mean? The allotment at that time was a form of wages, to employ a term applicable to present-day relationships. In capitalist produc-

tion, wages are paid to the workers in money. The profit of the capitalist is realised in the form of money. Necessary labour and surplus-labour (i.e., the labour that pays for the maintenance of the worker and the labour that yields unpaid surplus-value to the capitalist) are combined in the single process of labour in the factory, in a single working day at the factory, etc. The situation is different in the corvée economy. Here, too, there is necessary labour and surplus-labour, just as there is in the system of slavery. But these two kinds of labour are separated in time and space. The serf peasant works three days for his lord and three days for himself. He works for his lord on the latter's land or on the production of grain for him. For himself he works on allotted land, producing for

V. I. LENIN

himself and for his family the grain that is necessary for maintaining labour-power for the landlord.

Consequently, the feudal or corvée system of economy is similar to the capitalist system in that under both systems the one who works receives only the product of necessary labour, and turns over the product of surplus-labour gratis to the owner of the means of production. Serfdom, however, differs from the capitalist system in the three following respects. First, serf economy is natural economy, whereas capitalist economy is money economy. Secondly, in serf economy the instrument of exploitation is the tying of the worker to the land, the allotting of land to him, whereas under the capitalist economy it is the releasing of the worker from the land. In order to obtain an income (i.e., surplus-product), the serf-owning landlord must have on his land a peasant who possesses an allotment, implements and livestock. A landless,

horseless, non-farming peasant is useless as an object of feudal exploitation. In order to obtain an income (profit), the capitalist must have before him precisely a worker without land and without a farm, one who is compelled to sell his labour-power on a free labour-market. Thirdly, the allotment-holding peasant must be personally dependent upon the landlord, because he will not, possessing land, work for the landlord except under coercion. This system of economy gives rise to "non-economic coercion", to serfdom, juridical dependence, lack of full rights, etc. On the other hand, "ideal" capitalism implies the fullest freedom of contract on a free market between the property-owner and the proletarian.

Only if we are clear in our minds as to this economic substance of serf economy, or what is the same thing, corvée economy, can we understand the historical place and significance of labour service. Labour service is the direct and immediate survival of the corvée. Labour service is the transition from the corvée to capitalism. The substance of labour service is this: the landlord's land is cultivated by the peasants with their own implements in return for pay partly in cash and partly in kind (for land, for cut-off land, for use of pastures, for loans granted in winter, etc.). The form of economy known as the metayer system is a variety of labour service. The landlord economy based on labour requires a peasant who has an allotment, as well as implements and livestock if only of the poorest kind; it requires also that the peasant be weighed down by want and place himself in bondage. Bondage instead of free hire is the necessary concomitant of labour-service economy. Here the landlord acts not as a capitalist entrepreneur who owns money and the sum total of the instruments of labour, but—in a

system of labour-service economy—as a usurer, taking advantage of the poverty of his peasant neighbour to acquire his labour for next to nothing.....Consequently, the price of freely hired labour amounts to 10 rubles 69 kopeks, while under labour service it is 6 rubles. How is this phenomenon to be accounted for, if it is not something accidental or exceptional, but normal and usual? Words like "bondage", "usury", "extortion" etc., describe the form and nature of the transaction, but do not explain its economic substance. How is a peasant able over a number of years to perform work that is worth 10 rubles 69 kopeks for 6 rubles? He is able to do it because his allotment covers part of the expenditure of his family and makes it possible for his wage to be forced down below the "free hire" level. The peasant is compelled to do so precisely because his wretched allotment ties him down to his landlord neighbour, for it does not enable him to live off his own farm! Of course, this phenomenon can be "normal" only as one of the links of the process by which the corvée system is eliminated by capitalism. For the peasant is invariably ruined by these conditions, and is slowly but surely being transformed into a proletarian.....landlord's land cultivated in feudal fashion (on a metayer basis and rented out in small lots) produce smaller yields than allotment lands! This is a fact of tremendous importance, because it irrefutably proves that the main and fundamental cause of Russia's agricultural backwardness, of the stagnation of the whole of the national economy and the degradation of the tiller of the soil to a degree unparalleled anywhere else in the world, is the labour-service system,.....As things are at present, there is of course, some capitalist progress on the privately

(Contd. to Page 4)

(Contd. from Page 3)

owned economies, but it is exceedingly slow, and inevitably burdens Russia for many years to come with the political and social domination of the "wild landlord". We shall now examine how this progress manifests itself, and try to define some of its general results.

The fact that the yield of the "economic" crops i.e., the landed estates cultivated on capitalist line, is higher than on the peasant lands is an indication of the technical progress of capitalism in agriculture. (Italics added). This progress is due to the transition from the labour service to the wage-labour system. The ruin of the peasants, the decline in horse ownership, the loss of implements, the proletarianisation of the tiller, compel landlords to change over to cultivating their land with their own implementsThe conclusion we must arrive at from the examination of landlord farming is the following. Capitalism is quite obviously paving a way for itself in this field. Farming on a corvee basis is being replaced by farming on the basis of freely hired labour. Technical progress in capitalist agriculture compared with labour service and petty peasant farming is definitely in evidence in all directions. But this progress is exceptionally slow for a modern capitalist country.....(italics added).The distribution of allotment land is a familiar picture: the prosperous households are better provided with land per head of the population than the poor ones. The distribution of rented land is dozens of times more uneven. The highest group has three times as much allotment land as the lowest group (16.1 as against 5.4) but in regard to rented land the highest group has fifty times as much as the lowest group (16.6 as against 0.3). Thus, renting does not even out differences in the peasants' economic strength, but intensifies, increases them dozens of times over.....To proceed. If we see, on the one hand, house-

holds with no horses, or with only one horse, renting one dessiatine, or even part of a dessiatine, and, on the other hand, households with four or more horses, renting from 7 to 16 dessiatines, it is clear that here quantity is turning into quality. In the first case renting is the result of poverty and amounts to bondage. The "tenant" placed in such conditions cannot but become an object of exploitation by means of labour service, winter hiring, money loans, etc. On the other hand, the household that has from 12 to 16 dessiatines of allotment land and, **over and above this** rents from 7 to 16 dessiatines, obviously does so not because it is poor, but because it is well off, not to subsist but to get rich, to "get money". We have here a clear example of the conversion of land renting into capitalist farming, of the rise of capitalist enterprise in agriculture. Such households, as we shall see further on, do not get along without hiring agricultural labourers...entrepreneur renting of land among the peasantry is no isolated or casual phenomenon, but is general and universal. Everywhere there emerge in the village communes well to do households, which always constitute an insignificant minority and always organise capitalist farming with the aid of entrepreneur renting of land. For this reason general phrases about subsistence and capitalist renting can do nothing to clear up questions related to our peasant farming; a study must be made of the *concrete facts* regarding the development of feudal features in the renting of land, and regarding the formation of capitalist relations *within this very renting of land*.

We quoted figures above showing what ratios of the population and of allotment land are accounted for by the most well-to-do peasant households, comprising 20 per cent of the total. Now we may add that these concentrate

ON AGRARIAN QUESTION

in their hands from 50.8 to 83.7 per cent of all the land rented by the peasantry, leaving to the poorest groups, comprising 50 per cent of all households, from 5 to 16 per cent of the total rented land. The conclusion to be drawn from this is clear: if we are asked what kind of renting preponderates in Russia, subsistence or entrepreneur renting, renting through poverty or renting by well-to-do peasants, feudal renting (based on labour-service and bondage) or bourgeois renting, there can be only one answer. Among the households which rent land, undoubtedly the majority do so because of poverty. For the overwhelming majority of the peasants renting means bondage. If we take the quantity of land rented, undoubtedly not less than half of it is in the hands of well-to-do peasants, the rural bourgeoisie, who are organising agriculture on capitalist lines.....The renting and letting of land are phenomena in no way connected with the village commune and communal equalisation. Of what significance in real life will this equalised distribution of allotment land be, if the poor are forced to let to the rich the land allotted to them on the basis of equalisation? And what more striking refutation of "communist" views can one imagine than this fact, that real life **circumvents** the official, the register-established equalisation of allotments? **The impotence of any kind of equalisation in the face of developing capitalism is clearly demonstrated by the poor letting their allotments and of the rich concentrating rented land in their hands.** (Emphasis added).....We see, therefore, as a general phenomenon, **a decline in the role of allotment land in peasant farming**.....Among the poor peasants the role of allotment land is declining because their growing poverty and ruin **compel** them to let their land, to

abandon it, to **reduce** the land under cultivation because they lack livestock, implements, seed, and money, and either to hire themselves out on some job or....to enter the kingdom of heaven. The lower groups of peasants are dying out; famine, scurvy, typhus are doing their work. Among the higher groups of peasants the importance of allotment land is declining because their expanding farms are forced far beyond the bounds of this allotment land, and they have to base themselves on a new type of landownership, not bonded but free, not of the ancient-tribal kind but bought in the market: on the purchase are the traces of serfdom; the more rapidly economic development proceeds the more energetic is this emancipation from allotment land, the drawing of all land into the sphere of commerce, the establishment of commercial farming on rented land.....In examining peasant farming we have up till now taken the peasants mainly as proprietors; at the same time we pointed to the fact that the lower groups are being continuously squeezed out of that category. Where do they land? Evidently in the ranks of the proletariat.....We have shown how the landlord and the well-to-do peasant are transformed into employers of labour. Now let us see how the peasant is transformed into a hired labourer.....It will be seen that a distinguishing feature of the well-to-do households is that they have more of their own family as workers than the poor households have. Nevertheless, they employ incomparably more hired labourers.....the hiring of day-labourers turns out to be very considerably widespread even among the middle group of peasants: in the two higher groups (constituting 10.3 per cent of the households) the majority of households hire labourers, while in the group cultivating from 10 to 20

dessiatines (22.4 percent), **more than two-fifths** of the households hire labourers for reaping. The conclusion to be drawn from this is that well to do peasants could not exist if there were not a vast army of agricultural labourers ready to serve them.....Farming on his allotment is regarded as the peasant's real occupation; all other occupations are classed as side "employment" or "industries" and in doing so economic categories are lumped together that should be entered separately by anyone knowing the ABC of political economy. For example the category "agricultural industrialists" includes, together with the mass of wage-labourers, also entrepreneur farmers (for example, melon growers); next to them, also in the category "households with employments", will be included beggars and traders, domestic servants and master-craftsmen, etc.The growth in the number of agricultural wage-workers is directly connected with the development of that capitalist enterprise in agriculture which we have traced in landlord and peasant economy. Emphases added...As I have already mentioned, incidentally, above,.....figures evidence the increasing expropriation of the peasantry. The one million increase in the number of households went entirely to enlarge the two lowest groups. The total number of horses declined in this period from 16.91 to 16.87 millions, that is to say, the peasantry as a whole became somewhat poorer in horses. The highest group also became poorer in horses: in 1888-91 it had 5.5 horses per household compared with 5.5 in 1896-1900.

In no single capitalist country, in no single branch of economy, is there, or can there be (the market being predominant) an even process of development: capitalism cannot develop otherwise than in leaps and zigzags, now rapidly advancing,

(Contd. to Page 5)

(Contd. from Page 4)

ON AGRARIAN QUESTION

now dropping temporarily below the previous level. And the crux of the matter concerning the Russian agrarian crisis and the forthcoming upheaval is not what degree of development has been reached by capitalism, or what the rate of that development is, but whether it is, or is not, a capitalist crisis and upheaval, whether it is, or is not, taking place in conditions in which the peasantry is being transformed into a rural bourgeoisie and a proletariat, and whether the relations between the various households within the commune are, or are not, bourgeois relations. In other words: the primary object of any study of the agrarian question in Russia is to establish the basic data for characterising the class substance of agrarian relations. And only after we have established what classes and what trend of development we are dealing with, can we take up particular questions about the rate of development, the various modifications in the general trend of development, etc.....We must now also examine the question of the development of commercial farming in Russia. The forgoing exposition included, as a premise, the well-known fact that the whole of the post-reform period is distinguished by the growth of trade and exchange....The most precise data on the first question are contained in the budget statistics of the Voronezh Zemstov. From these statistics we are able to separate the money expenditure and income of a peasant family from the total expenditure and income (gross incomes and expenditures were given above).....even the farm of the middle peasant—leave alone that of the well-to-do and of the impoverished, semi-proletarian, peasants—is subordinated to the market to a very powerful extent. Hence all arguments about

peasant farming which ignore the predominant and growing role of the market, of exchange, of commodity production, are fundamentally wrong. The abolition of the feudal latifundia and of landlordism—a measure upon which all the thoughts of the Russian peasantry were concentrated at the end of the nineteenth century—will increase and not diminish the power of the market, for the growth of trade and commodity production is retarded by labour service and bondage.

In regard to the second question, it must be pointed out that the penetration of capital into agriculture is a distinctive process which cannot be properly understood if we confine ourselves to bald figures covering the whole of Russia. Agriculture becomes commercial not suddenly, and not to an equal degree on different farms and in different parts of the country. On the contrary, the market usually subordinates to itself one aspect of the complex economy of agriculture in one locality and another aspect in another, the remaining aspects not disappearing, but adapting themselves to the "main", i.e., the money, aspect. For example, in one area it is mainly commercial grain farming, that develops: the staple produced for sale is grain. Livestock raising plays a subordinate role in such farming, and further—in extreme cases of the one-sided development of grain farming almost disappears...The penetration of exchange and trade into agriculture gives rise to its specialisation, and this specialisation steadily increases. The same economic indexes (the number of horses, for example) acquire a different significance in different regions of commercial agriculture. Among the horseless peasants in the environs of the capital cities there are for example, big farmers who possess, say, dairy cattle, do a big volume of business and employ wage-

labour. Of course the number of such farmers among the mass of horseless and one-horse peasants is absolutely insignificant: but if we take just the gross figures covering the whole country we shall not be able to trace the special type of capitalism in agriculture.

This circumstance deserves special notice. If it is ignored, a correct picture or the development of capitalism in agriculture cannot be obtained, and it is easy to fall into the error of vulgarisation. The full complexity of the process can be grasped only by taking into account the real specific features of agriculture. It is utterly wrong to say that, owing to its specific features, agriculture is not subject to the laws of capitalist development. It is true that the specific features of agriculture hinder its subordination to the market; nevertheless, everywhere and in all countries the growth of commercial agriculture is proceeding apace. But the forms in which this formation of commercial agriculture takes place are indeed distinctive, and call for special methods of study....The new economic organism that is hatching out of its feudal shell in Russia is commercial agriculture and capitalism. The economics of landlord farming, when it is not being conducted on the basis of labour service or the bondage of the allotment-holding peasant, clearly reveal capitalist features. The economics of peasant farming—in so far as we are able to look inside the commune and see what is going on in real life despite the official equalisation of allotment land—again reveal purely capitalist features everywhere. Commercial agriculture is steadily growing in Russia in spite of all obstacles, and this commercial agriculture is inevitably being transformed into capitalist agriculture, although the forms of this transformation are diverse in the highest degree and vary from district to

district.....In Russia, to this very day, ownership both by the landlords and, to a considerable extent, by the peasants is medieval.....That system can be abolished at one stroke by a determined break with the past. Such a measure would be the nationalisation of the land, which all the representatives of the peasantry were demanding, more or less consistently, in the period between 1905 and 1907. The abolition of private property in land in no way changes the bourgeois basis of commercial and capitalist landowning. There is nothing more erroneous than the opinion that the nationalisation of the land has anything in common with socialism, or even with equalised land tenure. Socialism, as we know, means the abolition of commodity economy. Nationalisation, on the other hand, means converting the land into the property of the state, and such a conversion does not in the least affect private farming on the land. The system of farming on the land is not altered by whether the land is the property or "possession" of the whole country, of the whole nation, just as the (capitalist) system of farming by the well-to-do muzhik is not altered by whether he buys land "in perpetuity" rents land from the landlord or the state, or "gathers up" the allotment plots of the impoverished, insolvents. So long as exchange remains, it is ridiculous to talk of socialism. The exchange of agricultural produce and means of production does not depend upon the forms of landowning at all. (I will remark in parenthesis that I am setting forth here only the economic significance of nationalisation, not advocating it as a programme; that I have done in the work referred to above.)

As to equalisation, we have already shown above how it is applied in practice in the distribution of allotment land. We have seen that, within the commune, allotment land

is distributed fairly equally, with only a slight tendency in favour of the rich peasants. But in the long run very little trace is left of this equalisation, owing to the fact that the poor let their land and that rented land is concentrated in the hands of the rich peasants. Clearly no equalisation of landholding is able to eliminate inequality in the actual use of the land, so long as there exist property differences among the peasants and a system of exchange which aggravates these differences.

The economic significance of nationalisation does not lie at all where it is very often sought. It does not consist in the fight against bourgeois relationships (as Marx showed long ago, nationalisation is a highly consistent bourgeois measure) but in the fight against feudal relationships. The multiplicity of medieval forms of landowning hamper trade; the disparity between the old system of landowning and the new economy gives rise to sharp contradictions; owing to the latifundia, the landlords prolong the existence of labour service: the peasants are shut up, as in a ghetto, within the allotment system, the framework of which is broken down in practice at every step. Nationalisation makes a clean sweep of all medieval relations in landowning, does away with all artificial barriers on the land, and makes the land really free—for whom? For every citizen? Nothing of the kind. The freedom of the horseless peasant (i.e., 31/4 million households) consists, as we have seen, in letting his allotment land. The land becomes free for the farmer, for the one who really wants, and is able, to cultivate it according to the requirements of modern farming in general and of the world market in particular. Nationalisation would hasten the death of serfdom and the development of purely bourgeois farming on land free of all medieval lumber. That is the real historical significance of

(Contd. to Page 8)

Fascism Is A Peculiar Fusion Between Spiritualism and Science

(Contd. from Page 2)

in varying degrees, in all the capitalist countries of the world, not excluding the backward countries in Asia and Africa. These historical experience of the age calls for a revision of the classical concept about fascism. In the pre-war days with the establishment of fascism in Italy and Germany, both of which were developed capitalist countries with practically no colony, the idea gained ground that facism could grow and develop in powerful capitalist countries alone. Highly developed capitalist economy, suffering from severe want of market and strong military might were considered as essential requirements for the establishment of fascism. The growing tendency of fascization in some of the economically and militarily weak capitalist countries in Asia and Africa and the establishment of military and fascist dictatorship in some such other countries prove the incorrectness of the old postulation."

[Socialist Unity. Vol. 1 (New series) July 1, 1962.]

Pointing out again on the mistaken, too much, one sided emphasis on open terroristic method as the sole cause for the fascism's accession to power, Comrade Ghosh showed "Fascism always and everywhere adopts a dual policy of suppression and persuasion. It's aim is not so much to ruthlessly suppress the mass force as to win it over to its side as volunteers, willing to carry out fascist plans and programmes for national reconstruction. Without a co-operating mass force at its back, fascism can hardly hold its sway. Fascism, therefore, adopts Social Democratic plans, grants minor economic concession to the people, tries to control anarchy in capitalist economy and insecurity in life flowing therefrom like unemployment etc. In its drive to save the aggregate interests of the capitalist class it even imposes restrictions on individual capitalists and their

freedom of anarchical production. In short, a fascist state takes the position of a so called bourgeois welfare state. Along with these so called welfare measures, it carries relentless ideological battles to weed out revolutionary ideas. And when the unconscious masses take these measures as anti-capitalist, pro-people measures and lend the fascists enthusiastic support in the carrying out of their plans and programmes, the fascists concentrate all their powers to exterminate communism spiritually and the communists physically. In its crusade against communism fascism advocates its own fascistic culture, a queer admixture of social-democratism, national jingoism and selfloathing mysticism" (ibid).

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, drew the most serious attention of the working class movement to the real source of strength of the fascists, a point of serious danger too, in the cultural field where a void exists in all the bourgeois countries, awaiting proletarian revolution. Comrade Shibdas Ghosh shows: "Unlike in the past, bourgeois humanist moral values, to-day, are wholly incapable to develop mental formations, revolutionary in content which can give a revolutionary turn to social progress. But in its place, the higher ethical and moral values based on the noble ideology of communism have not yet developed and spread enough so as to grip the society. This unmistakably shows the weakness in the ideological cultural struggle of the communist movement. As a result the vacuum that persists in the fields of morality and ethics within social life has been the principal cause for the crisis in culture, as we are witnessing to-day".

(A free translation from a Bengali article of Com. Shibdas Ghosh, published in the Autumn Annual of Bengali weekly 'Darpan' 1966 under the caption 'Sanskritir Sankat-O Fasci-bad' (Crisis in culture and

Fascism. Editor, P. Era.)

This offers a free field for the fascists to penetrate in the cultural life of the people frustrated with loss of faith in the bourgeois humanist values and sense of morals. The purpose and objects of the Fascists in the realm of culture and ethics have been analysed by Comrade Shibdas Ghosh in the following lines:

"Fascism is a peculiar fusion of spiritualism with science. The adoption of the technological aspects of science in its bid to develop the economic and military might of the fascist state and the dishing out of all sorts of anti-science religious fads and idealistic hocus-pocus as the panacea of all the ills, which are concomitant evils of the exploiting capitalist system, of the present society, go together in the name of national culture and heritage. Fascist culture is, thus a contradictory amalgum of scientific or truthful and illusory elements. The scientific element is stronger in its views about natural process while the illusory element is stronger in its views about social processes. *The aim is to turn the mental process of the people from the scientific path of causality to the mystic alley of blind faith, preconception and obscurantism, ultimately developing contempt for social action.* In keeping with its unscientific illusory social outlook, fascism rejects the socio-scientific law of class struggle as the motive force of the development of society and in its stead, postulates the theory of class-harmony and class collaboration. As such non-class or supra-class ideas dominate fascist culture.

National jingoism has, always, been a powerful instrument in the hands of the bourgeoisie to poison mass-mind against the ideology of class struggle and proletarian internationalism. The fascists make the best use of it to further their ends. It must be borne in mind

that reactionary nationalism, as preached by the bourgeoisie and patriotism of the masses of the people are not one and the same. Patriotism of the masses has no conflict with the ideology of proletarian internationalism, rather without being an upholder of the ideology of proletarian internationalism, one can not be truly patriotic.....bourgeois nationalism is an expression of bourgeois world outlook and a weapon in the hands of exploiters to exploit the patriotic sentiment of the people to the interests of the bourgeoisie, patriotism guided by the ideology of proletarian internationalism is a powerful instrument in the hands of the exploited people to liberate themselves from the exploiting system of imperialism-capitalism.....the ideology of proletarian internationalism flows from the fount of true love for the people and aims at battering all barriers of social progress. So fascism can ill-afford to tolerate real patriotic feeling of the people". ...

(Socialist Unity—ibid).

To another important aspect of fascism, Comrade Ghosh draws our attention. It is "The idea of class-harmony, union of all classes or of supra-class national interest, as advocated by the fascists, requires a concrete expression for presentation to the people. Fascism, therefore, propagates the idea of superman, the superman being the embodiment of national will and interests. No wonder, that decaying capitalism is falling back, more and more, on absolutism and mysticism overt and covert against which capitalism had to wage a struggle at the beginning"

(ibid).

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, has also drawn our attention to a prevalent misconception about the political form of a fascist state. Does it mean the inevitable disappearance of parliament or in other words does it mean a monopoly rule? Comrade

Ghosh has shown: "As to form also fascism presents no stereo-typed pattern.... somewhere it has adopted the form of individual dictatorship, somewhere the autocratic rule of military junta and yet in some other countries it has assumed the democratic garb, keeping the parliament still alive but limiting its power by economic and political centralisation. The appearance of fascism in democratic form through two-party parliamentary system of government is, certainly, a post-war social phenomenon, having no historical precedent, because of its seemingly democratic appearance it is, at the sametime the most deceptive. And in fact, it has been able to deceive many so-called intellectuals, who try to recognise fascism by its form and not by its content". (ibid).

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our beloved leader and teacher and a leading Marxist philosopher of our time has therefore imparted this valuable teaching to the working class movement that "to create a motive force for the acceleration of the process of uninterrupted revolution it is imperative for the working class party to win the masses over to its side to isolate completely all forms of reactionary bourgeois ideologies from the main current of the revolutionary movement, failing which revolution can never succeed".

The incidents of Hitler's 'Bloody Purge' by assassinating Rohem, the leader of his 'Brown Shirt' troops and despatching the left Fascists of Italy to Ethiopian war by Mussolini all of whom in their confusion took the Fascist movements as a kind of 'revolution' against capitalism, point out unmistakably the weakness in the ideological-political-cultural struggles within the communist movement. The Communist Parties of Italy and Germany due to their unawareness and at the

(Contd. to Page 7)

Those Who Cherish Human Values Liberties And Freedom Of Mankind Must Combine Their Strength To Fight Fascism

(Contd from Page 6)

same time unpreparedness to combat fascism in all these fields offered the psychological basis of the mass support behind the fascist movements in those countries and the fascists could exploit the frustrated petty-bourgeoisie as dupes.

Taking note with anguish, this darkest crime of fascism in its discovering how to use the forces of idealism for the purpose of preserving the purifying corpse of capitalism Romain Rolland, wrote, warning the youth of France against the falsehoods and deceptions of fascism. And in fact this may rightly be taken as a warning addressed to the youths of all countries who face fascist danger and become its victims.

That brilliant humanist mind addressing the youth wrote: "There is the danger. The mortal danger. All these youths, ardent, blinded, hot-headed, imagine themselves to be fighting for the ideal, and the interest of the community. They will wake up, to find themselves enslaved, and in the grip of high capitalism.

The adventure is not, however, a new one. Those who have already seen it unfold in Italy and in Germany should know by now. Here, as there, the same solemn promise to serve the cause of the social community. The same fraud, words, words; liberal tongues which promise reforms that are never carried out except on paper. But still the Great Fascist council and the Duce in Italy, in Germany the monstrous pair of Hitler-Thyssen continues to exploit the trustful and enchained people.....open their eyes for them, Comrades. Do not be content with fighting them. Enlighten them. If in the ranks of the businessmen and manufacturers, there are thousands of mercenaries, if there are also battalions of fanatical reactionaries with whom

all reasoning is futile, there are thousands of fine fellows who are being duped, who have no suspicion that they are being played with, that they are being armed, that they are being sent to fight those very things which they believe themselves to be defending."

(Romain Rolland—"I will not Rest"—quoted in Osborn's book P. 210).

Fascism propagates class harmony, Supra-class national interest, blind faith, mysticism and Superman.

The exaltation of 'faith' in place of 'reason' has been the principal arm in Fascist culture.

Osborn comments on this aspect: "Social reality demands a revolutionary change and all those...who are in touch with reality, who do not fear it but can see the promise of further progress which it holds, progressively onwards. Their criticisms of capitalist society spring from an examination of existing reality; for science is their best advocate. On the other hand, the defenders of capitalism are fighting against the demands of reality. They dare not recognise the potentialities involved in the present degree of control, which science has given man. That would be fatal for capitalism. But neither dare they recognise that in striving to preserve an outworn social system they are betraying a deep fear of reality. What they do insist is to deny the efficacy of science to comprehend reality.

They claim that there are other methods, more penetrating more revealing, giving a fuller and deeper understanding of reality than does the intellectualism of science"

(P. 238)

So Mussolini, the spiritual leader of Fascism wrote: "Doctrine beautifully defined and carefully elucidated with headlines and paragraphs, might be

lacking but there was to take its place something more decisive—faith."

(Mussolini—"The political and Social Doctrines of Fascism"—quoted in R.P. Dutt's book)

And Hitler, Mussolini's spiritual disciple echoes "The general mass of the nation do not consist of philosophers, faith for them is largely the sole basis for a moral view of life" (Quoted in Osborn's book).

This faith is the Nazi (Weltanschauung) outlook about national values to contain Marxism or science in every field and created the 'God complex' of Hitler and Mussolini in Germany and Italy. That is why, Comrades Shibdas Ghosh, our beloved leader and teacher, has taught us:

"In order to create confusion in mass mind and wean them away from class struggle, projection of the ideal of a superman as if divinely inspired, and above conflicting class interests and the myth of his supra-class outlook and character is done and constantly propagated (by the fascists)." (Free translation Ganadabi—1st September, 1949.)

Whoever wants Social progress, human values and liberties unhampered must fight Fascism, the menace to Civilisation

We have shown in our articles by citing concrete historic events and experiences the perfidious nature of fascism which is nothing but a perverted attempt to keep alive a thoroughly outworn capitalist social order when it is outliving its historic usefulness, and has become the stumbling block to social progress.

Fascism is therefore an outrage on man's creativeness, minimum human dignity and sense of values, a curse on human civilisation.

Fascism has demanded from human society a kind of slavery unprecedented in human history both in its vulgarity and the cost

of colossal waste of human and material resources. It has abrogated all the achievements of mankind in the realm of knowledge and demand similar abrogation of rights and the future from the toiling people who being the worthy inheritor of all the achievements in knowledge are marching forward to build up a newer and healthy society free from the last vestiges of exploitation of man by man.

So, not only the genuine communists but all lovers of humanity, freedom and true democracy find among themselves a common bond of sacred duty to fight fascism in every field of life wherever it tries to raise its ugly fang under whatever pretext, under whatever cover.

We, therefore sum up, before we conclude, for our guidance, the valuable lessons that fascist experiments in Italy and Germany as also the post-war phenomena have handed down to us:

Fascism, is a historically conditioned form of counter-revolution in which capitalism seeks to stave off proletarian revolution by an anticipatory move. Fascism, is economic centralisation, maximum concentration of political power in the state, rigid firmness in administration all leading to more and more indentification of the interests of the monopolists with that of the state, in defence of the aggregate interest of the capitalist class.

Fascism, may take the deceptive look by keeping alive parliament and allowing other bourgeois and petty-bourgeois parties to give the appearance of bourgeois democracy. Fascism has become the order in all the Capitalist States no matter whether developed or relatively underdeveloped when capitalism has entered the third phase of general crisis which is overall crisis

after the Second World War.

Fascism, always and everywhere adopts a dual policy of suppression and persuasion. It adopts Social-Democratic plans, grants minor economic concessions etc. and create confusion in mass mind by Social-Democratic postures and utterances and in the midst of this confusion crushes the revolutionary party, forces and movement.

Fascism, requires for its growth and development mass backing and therefore it can come only from the radical section of the bourgeoisie who have, taken the cudgels left by the Social-Democratic parties, against revolutionary movement.

Fascism is a peculiar fusion of Spiritualism with Science. It takes only the technological aspects of science for economic and military might but inculcates mysticism, blind faith, obscurantism in the cultural-social fields.

Fascism, propagates class-harmony, union of all classes, supra-class national interest and projects a superman as if with divine inspiration and above the conflicting class interests.

Fascism, promotes national jingoism, fosters racial and communal hatred and all backward sentiments amongst the masses.

Whoever will want to resist fascism, the menace to humanity in present time, those who cherish human values, liberties and freedom of mankind to their heart can not rest content with not only pondering deeply over the various aspects of fascism and the appropriate lessons, we have presented in our writings but would surely feel the urge to combine their strength in the social battle against fascism.

(Concluded)

(Contd. from Page 1)

but was in the midst of the people through and through, pulsated with the throbbing of hearts of those who have been robbed, oppressed and denied the recognition as man by a cruel society.

But his militant humanism and uncompromising fight against social injustice brought him nearer to proletarian approach and culture. Here lies his greatness which Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, our revered teacher and leader and an eminent Marxist Philosopher of this era has rightly pointed out in our country, for the first time.

Right from the beginning of the historic efforts to build up a real Working Class Party—the SUCI in our country, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh showed to the people, the importance of assimilating the secular humanist democratic ideas and thoughts that reached the highest peak in Sarat Chandra's literary creation. He explained that only through serious cultivation of this ideals of Saratchandra, assimilating and exhausting them completely in the process the real proletarian culture can grow as a break which alone can cater to the needs of proletarian revolution and hence the working class movement in our country. It was Comrade Shibdas Ghosh, an eminent Marxist thinker of our time, our beloved teacher and leader who for the first time brought home the real worth of Saratchandra's contributions to our social progress. It was he, who rescued this great artist and his contributions from the cobweb of indifference, apathy and motivated distortions spun by the vested interest and the philistines.

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has given detailed and brilliant Marxist Leninist analyses of Saratchandra's works and different important aspects of his personality. We take this opportunity to give free translation of only a few

excerpts from his speeches which would throw light on some of the important aspects of Saratchandra's historic role and contributions. It goes without saying that the responsibility for this translation is entirely of the Editor.

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has said:—

"In evaluating Sarat Chandra's literary works or for that matter any literary work, we are to carefully keep in our mind,—the particular time or the particular stage of social development when the concerned artist appeared and made his literary contribution. We are to take note of that particular stage of social development, historic time and social environment that confront the artist. We would therefore commit grievous mistake if we judge an artist and his creation, his philosophical outlook, independent of his time and social environment. Because man's thoughts and ideas, his mental horizon are defined by the material condition or in other words the historical time, social development and environment. It is only after the ingredients, the materials or to be more precise, the material conditions come into being inside the society that ideas can grow and blossom through their interaction in human brain.

".....And for this in literature also, no everlasting or eternal truth, thoughts and ideas, principles and precepts or cultural edifice can guide mankind for all time to come. At best, the thoughts and ideas of a particular stage can stretch forward to cover the needs of a few more stages to help in the progress of mankind to some extent. But the thoughts and ideas which once provided guidance to social progress—the progressive movement in the society for human welfare, upliftment and development become, one day, out-worn and obsolete in new social environment,

faced with newer problems of life.

"So, if we judge Saratchandra and his literary contributions with scientific yard stick, we will find: Saratchandra's literary ideas and outlook are in the main, materialist. Where, he failed to maintain the continuity in materialist outlook, he became at best an agnostic. But never did he pin his faith on spiritualism. Never did he compromise with supernaturalism in his literary ideas and literary works.

"Now, we are to determine by the yardstick of the concepts of social progress or reaction in that given situation as to which among the two trends—compromising and uncompromising in our national liberation movement against imperialism—feudalism, both in its political and cultural aspects, could be conducive to the growth and development of progressive and revolutionary movement in our present day society. We are to determine, in the continuity or logical culmination of which of these two trends the birth of a new class-consciousness of anti-capitalist revolution of the proletariat and the proletarian culture can take place in our society.

"Judging from this angle, it would be obvious that this very trend and tune of uncompromising revolutionary spirit and youthful vigour of secular humanism of European Renaissance which was reflected in the literary thoughts and values of Saratchandra can, we believe, give birth to the proletarian cultural movement in the present-day condition of our country following the process of continuity and break.

"No doubt, on the firm basis of Saratchandra's literary ideas and the value he steadfastly upheld, the new proletarian cultural movement of to-day have to be developed but contradiction between the two would also inevitably

crop up.....So, I make bold to assert that it was Saratchandra and Saratchandra alone among host of litterateurs of that period who discharged the obligation to the cause of social revolution in literary field with singular devotion and sincerity of purpose; while others thought of doing their duties by talking of social revolution without caring to do what was necessary to bring that dream of social revolution to reality viz. to stir up people's hatred against the obsolete social order and in order to convince the mass mind of the utter futility to keep alive these out-worn social order to stir up deep pathos and pain, sense of sorrow or mortification, yearning for a new and more progressive social order where the felt needs of the time would thrive. Such were the concrete tasks in the literary field which Saratchandra alone did in his time.

No wonder, therefore, that the vested interest, the social highups in the Hindu Society came down so heavily against Saratchandra. He was the target of attack of these orthodox social force".

Regarding Saratchandra's literary style, giving powerful rebuff to the so-called critics, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has shown; "Saratchandra presented in his literary works the highest of theories, but he did it through the medium of stories, in the form of dialogues and through the vehicle of *Rasa* creating, so to say, a master piece of art and aesthetics. But he never wrote anything which can sound as a sermon. Herein lies his excellence, tremendous effectivity and success as a writer".

Dealing with the importance of literature or for that matter the role of a litterateur in the social revolution, Comrade Shibdas Ghosh has pointed out;

"Be it a movement for national liberation or any social revolution, for any radical transformation of the society which can only be achieved in the appropriate political climate in the society, the role of a litterateur is in helping to create the social mind and cultural background conducive and complementary to that appropriate political climate and here lies the test of his progressive role. From that aspects if we judge we are to come to the conclusion that at the particular stage of national liberation movement and the Renaissance in our social-cultural fields,—at that

particular stage of social urge for radical change in Indian society, it was Saratchandra who alone played the most advanced and pioneering role in literary field which were conducive and complementary to such movements".

Comrade Shibdas Ghosh our beloved leader and teacher and one of the fore-ranking Marxist philosophers of our time has therefore brought to our countrymen, for the first time, the true worth and glory of Saratchandra and his creations and has thereby saved not only those noble creations from dishonour but also us from failure to judge the true worth of something noble which should be a just pride for the creativeness of our soil.

This testifies, again, the truth that it is only the genuine Marxists who alone can make proper appreciation, can adore, whatever is noble creativeness, whatever worth taking pride of, because they are the true inheritors as they alone possess the scientific approach to the society which a correct understanding of Marxist-Leninist science imparts.

On Agrarian Question

(Contd. from Page 5)

nationalisation in Russia.....
...It is often thought in Russia that nationalisation of the land means removing the land from the sphere of commerce. This, undoubtedly, is the point of view of the majority of the advanced peasants and of ideologists of the peasantry. But this view is deeply fallacious. The very opposite is the case. Private property in land is an obstacle to the free investment of capital in land. Therefore, where the free renting of land from the state exists (and this is the essence of nationalisation in bourgeois society) the land is drawn more energetically into the sphere of commerce than is the case where private property prevails. There is much more freedom of capital investment in land, and freedom of competition in agriculture, where land is freely rented than where land is private property. Nationalisation of the land is, as it were, landlordism without the landlord. And what landlordism in the capitalist development of agriculture means is explained in the remarkably profound arguments of Marx in his *Theories of Surplus-Value*.....
[VI Lenin: The Agrarian Question in Russia towards the close of the Nineteenth Century.]